Remarks

Applicant has carefully reviewed the application in light of the June 30, 2008 Advisory Action. To further prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1, 20, and 33 to clarify the recited subject matter. As amended, the claims now relate to a physical-document monitoring device that senses a state of a physical document with a sensor coupled to a document coupling device, generates a signal representing the document state with the sensor, and determines the document state based on the signal with a computer coupled to the sensor and the document coupling device. Nowhere, however, do the cited references teach such limitations.

U.S. Patent No. 7,129,840 issued to Hull et al. ("Hull"), for example, discloses a monitoring device 100 that includes a structure 104 (e.g., a desktop) in which sensors 112 are mounted and a detection module 106 that receives a collection of signals produced by the sensors. col. 2, ll. 34-59; Fig. 1. When a document having an RFID tag 416 is placed on the structure 104, the sensors 112 interrogate the tag, which responds with information stored in the tag (e.g., an identifier), and the detection module 106 stores output signals for the sensors 112 that detect the tag's response, which provides an indication of the document's position. col. 4, l. 49-col. 5, l. 24; Fig. 4. Thus, Hull fails to teach a sensor coupled to a document coupling device and operable to sense a state of a document and to generate a signal representative thereof because the document RFID tags 416 in Hull simply output stored information to the sensors 112, which are located in structure 104. Moreover, the claims call for determining the document state based on the signal with a computer coupled to the sensor and the document coupling device, which Hull fails to teach.

Hull also fails to teach the limitations of the dependent claims. For example, claim 4 specifies that "the document coupling device is part of the sensor and facilitates sensing the document state." Hull, however, only discloses that RFID tags may be coupled to a document attachment device, col. 4, ll. 4-19, and sensors 112 are part of structure 104. Thus, Hull fails to teach that a sensor includes a document coupling device. As a further example, claim 8 recites "a wireless communication device coupled to the computer, the wireless communication device operable to send data from and receive data for the computer." Nowhere, however, does Hull

teach a wireless communication device coupled to the computer of a document monitoring device. As an additional example, claim 10 specifies that "the received data comprises state data for a non-physical version of a document." But while Hull discloses that information regarding a non-physical version of a document may exist, col. 4, ll. 20-38, Hull also discloses that the information is stored in a database, col. 4, ll. 39-48. In fact, Hull discloses that a document identifier from a document's RFID tag is used to map to the document information. Id. Thus, Hull fails to teach receiving state data for a non-physical version of a document at a physical-document monitoring device. For at least these reasons, and for the reasons given with respect to the independent claims, Applicant submits that Hull fails to teach all of the limitations of any of the dependent claims.

Applicant asks that all claims be examined in view of the amendment to the claims.

Please charge deposit account 06-1050 $1050 for a three-month extension of time. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2008

William R. Borchers
Reg. No. 44,549

1180 Peachtree Street, N.E., 21st Floor
Atlanta, GA 30309
Telephone: (404) 892-5005
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945